



Brookland Neighborhood Civic Association

1502 Otis Street, N E Washington, D C 20017 ♦ 202 529-0953

March 6 2012

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2012 MAR 30 PM 12:17

Ms Sharon Schellin
Secretary to the D C Zoning Commission
441 4th Street, N W Suite 210S
Washington D C 20001

Re Case No 10 28 PUD and Zoning Map Amendment Application of 901 Monroe Street LLC –
**Supplement to Motion to Re Open the Record Corrections to the Applicant's Proposed Findings
of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

Dear Ms Schellin

This letter provides more detail regarding the corrections to the Findings of Fact and
Conclusions of Law proposed by the Applicant to the Zoning Commission in Case No 10 28

On March 1 2012 the Applicant submitted proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions
of Law Item # 55 and Item #57 of the proposed Findings of Fact inadvertently mischaracterize
the Brookland Neighborhood Civic Association s (BNCA) testimony in the case

I Item #55

Item #55 under Parties in Support states

BNCA testified as a party in support of the application Caroline Petti testified on
behalf of the BNCA Ms Petti testified that BNCA held two votes on the application She
stated that the first vote held on September 13 2011 was against the C 2 B map amendment
and in favor of a C 2 A map amendment She stated that the second vote held on December 13
2011 was in favor of the proposed project with a C 2 A map amendment (Emphasis added)

It is inaccurate to say that I stated that the December 13 2011 vote was in favor of the
proposed project with a C 2 A map amendment Both in written and oral testimony and in
answer to a follow up question I stated that the December 13 2011 vote was in favor of the
proposed project I stated that the September 13 2011 vote was against the C 2 B map
amendment and in favor of a C 2 A map amendment (1/19 Tr 255 256)

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO 10-28
EXHIBIT NO 328
ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.10-28
EXHIBIT NO.328

The last two sentences of Item #55 should be corrected to read as follows

She stated that the first vote held on September 13 2011 was against the C 2 B map amendment and in favor of a C 2 A map amendment She stated that the second vote held on December 13 2011 was in favor of the proposed project

II Item #57

Item #57 under Parties in Support states

Ms Pettt further testified that BNCA voted to support a C 2 A map amendment instead of the proposed C 2 B because of the precedent that C 2 B may set for the neighborhood Ms Pettt requested that the Commission approve the project with a C 2 A related Zoning Map Amendment

The first sentence of Item #57 inaccurately implies I only cited one reason (i e because of the precedent that C 2 B may set for the neighborhood) for BNCA s vote in support of C 2 A zoning for the project

The first sentence of Item #57 should be corrected as follows so that it accurately reflects all of the reasons I cited in my testimony

Ms Pettt further testified that BNCA voted to support a C 2 A map amendment instead of the proposed C 2 B because C 2 A s lower height lower density is more in scale with the surrounding neighborhood C 2 B sets an unacceptable precedent for future Brookland development east of the tracks C 2 B is more than is needed to be a profitable project, C 2 A would be possible if minor modifications were made to reduce the project s density C 2 A is preferred by residents adjacent to the proposed project (i e 200 footers) and their views should be given great consideration and last but not least C 2 B is contrary to the Brookland Small Area Plan which specifies a maximum of 50 feet through a PUD (1/19 Tr 244 245)

Thank you for this opportunity to suggest these corrections to the Applicant s proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Sincerely

Caroline Pettt
Caroline Pettt President